

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO.            | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|----------------------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/695,907                 | 10/30/2003  | Masaru Yarita        | Q78282 5656         |                  |
| 65565 7590 05/15/2007 EXAM |             |                      |                     | INER             |
| 2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVE. NW  |             |                      | CHOW, JEFFREY J     |                  |
| WASHINGTON, DC 20037-3213  |             |                      | ART UNIT            | PAPER NUMBER     |
|                            |             |                      | 2628                |                  |
|                            |             |                      |                     |                  |
|                            |             | •                    | MAIL DATE           | DELIVERY MODE    |
|                            |             |                      | 05/15/2007          | PAPER            |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

| Application No. | Applicant(s)   |  |
|-----------------|----------------|--|
| 10/695,907      | YARITA, MASARU |  |
| Examiner        | Art Unit       |  |
| Jeffrey J. Chow | 2628           |  |

|  | Jeffrey J. Chow   | 2628  |   |  |  |  |
|--|---|---|---|--|--|--|
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appe  | ars on the cover sheet with the c   | orrespondence add                                   | ress                                    |  |  |  |
| THE REPLY FILED <u>02 May 2007</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APP   | LICATION IN CONDITION FOR AL  | LOWANCE.  |   |  |  |  |
| 1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on<br>this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow<br>places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a No<br>a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance<br>time periods:   | wing replies: (1) an amendment, aff<br>tice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in (  | fidavit, or other evider<br>compliance with 37 C    | nce, which<br>FR 41.31; or (3)          |  |  |  |
| a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date   | of the final rejection.   |   |   |  |  |  |
| b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 7   | ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailin<br>(b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THI<br>06.07(f).   | g date of the final rejecti<br>E FIRST REPLY WAS F  | on.<br>ILED WITHIN                      |  |  |  |
| Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ex under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL  | tension and the corresponding amount<br>shortened statutory period for reply orig<br>r than three months after the mailing da | of the fee. The approprinally set in the final Offi | iate extension fee ce action; or (2) as |  |  |  |
| <ol> <li>The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp<br/>filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exte<br/>a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed<br/>AMENDMENTS</li> </ol>   | nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to   | avoid dismissal of th                               | ns of the date of<br>the appeal. Since  |  |  |  |
|  | huit mains to the state of filling a build  | will make a surface of the                          |   |  |  |  |
| <ol> <li>The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection,</li> <li>They raise new issues that would require further co</li> <li>They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below that the proposed in th</li></ol> | nsideration and/or search (see NO ow);  | TE below);  |   |  |  |  |
| (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in begappeal; and/or  | tter form for appeal by materially re   | ducing or simplifying                               | the issues for                          |  |  |  |
| (d) They present additional claims without canceling a   |   | ected claims.                                       |   |  |  |  |
| NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).   |   |   |   |  |  |  |
| 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).  |   |   |   |  |  |  |
| <ul><li>5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):</li><li>6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the</li></ul>  |   |   |   |  |  |  |
| non-allowable claim(s).  |   |   |   |  |  |  |
| 7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:  |   | ll be entered and an e                              | explanation of                          |  |  |  |
| Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:  |   |   |   |  |  |  |
| Claim(s) rejected: 1-3 and 13.   |   |   |   |  |  |  |
| Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: <u>4-11</u> .   |   |   |   |  |  |  |
| <ul> <li>AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE</li> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ul>  |   |   |   |  |  |  |
| 9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing<br>entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to<br>showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar   | overcome all rejections under appe  | al and/or appellant fai                             | ils to provide a                        |  |  |  |
| 10.   The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation   | on of the status of the claims after e  | ntry is below or attach                             | ned.                                    |  |  |  |
| REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER  | d door NOT along the gamble tion is   |   | <b>b</b>                                |  |  |  |
| <ol> <li>The request for reconsideration has been considered bu<br/><u>See Continuation Sheet.</u></li> </ol>  | it does NOT place the application if  | n condition for allowal                             | nce because:                            |  |  |  |
| 12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).   | (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)   |   |   |  |  |  |
| 13. Other:   |   | MMALLU<br>ULKA J. CH                                | achan                                   |  |  |  |
|  |   | ULKAJ. CH/<br>PRIMARY EX                            | AUHAN<br>AMINEE                         |  |  |  |
|  |   |   |   |  |  |  |

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant argues that Stetson (US 2006/0111623) does not teach determining a rotating angel of a matrix so as to minimize a distribution range of the first and second data sets projected on an axis of a coordinate system (pages 7 and 8). The original disclosure recites, "the waveform whose noise has been reduced can be obtained from the data pertaining to an axial component at which the distribution range of the projected data is minimized" (page 22, lines 15 - 18). Stetson discloses fully separating the signal and the noise through rotation (paragraph 34). One way of doing so would to heuristically sweep through a large range of angles about which to rotate the principal components (paragraph 35). Separating the noise from the signal would minimize the distribution range as the signal is separated from the noise and therefore has very little noise in the signal.